

THE DIRECT SUMMAND CONJECTURE IN DIMENSION THREE

RAYMOND C. HEITMANN

In [Ho1], Hochster proved the following results:

Theorem (Hochster). *If R is a regular Noetherian ring which contains a field and $S \supset R$ is a module-finite R -algebra, then R is a direct summand of S as an R -module.*

Theorem (Hochster). *If S is any local ring which contains a field and $x_1, \dots, x_n$ is a system of parameters for S , then for every integer $k \geq 0$, $(x_1 \cdots x_n)^k \notin (x_1^{k+1}, \dots, x_n^{k+1})S$.*

The mixed characteristic case of these results is easy for $\dim R \leq 2$ but relatively little is known for $\dim R > 2$. The general statements, which are equivalent, became known as the direct summand and monomial conjectures. The principal advance in this subject occurred in Hochster's 1983 article [Ho2] in which he introduced the canonical element conjecture. He demonstrated that this new conjecture was equivalent to the other two both overall and in the case of fixed dimension. He also showed that it was sufficiently strong to imply the validity of a number of other homological conjectures which had been shown to follow from the big Cohen-Macaulay modules conjecture.

In this article, we prove a result (Theorem 3.7) which implies the three dimensional case of the direct summand conjecture and so also the three dimensional cases of each of the conjectures that follow from it. As it happens, most of these results also follow from the New Intersection Theorem which was proved by Roberts in the mixed characteristic case [R1]. Two exceptions are the improved new intersection conjecture and the mixed characteristic version of the Evans-Griffith Syzygy Theorem [EG]. These two are now theorems in the three dimensional case. It should also be noted that Hochster [Ho3] has just proved the existence of balanced big Cohen-Macaulay algebras in dimension three — using (3.7) as a key ingredient of the proof.

The main result of this article is of independent interest. In [H2], the author introduced several forms of an extended plus closure. These were intended to fill the void due to the absence of a tight closure analog in mixed characteristic. A key property of the tight closure is the colon-capturing property. Theorem 3.7 tells us that the extended plus closures have the colon-capturing property in dimension three, at least for excellent rings. It was shown in [H2] that if any of these new closures had the colon-capturing property, it would follow that the closures would also have a second very desirable property — that all ideals in regular local rings are closed. There is an additional implication concerning the Briançon-Skoda Theorem, proved in the general case by Lipman and Sathaye [LS]. In [H2, p.818], mimicking the tight closure treatment, a generalization of this result was proved for the extended plus closures. Unfortunately, this result is not a true generalization in that it would only imply the original result if ideals in regular rings were closed. This result now does imply the original in the three dimensional case. So Theorem 3.7 goes a long way towards establishing a good closure operation for three dimensional mixed characteristic rings.

This research was partially supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation, DMS-0100731.

For the direct summand conjecture, the property that we in fact need is that ideals in regular rings are closed under the extended plus closure. This in turn implies that such ideals are closed under the plus closure. This latter property is equivalent to the direct summand conjecture.

1. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout, R will be a commutative integral domain with unity. Also, R will be semi-local of mixed characteristic, that is, the Jacobson radical of R will contain a prime integer p which is nonzero as an element of the ring. We further assume that each maximal ideal of R has the same height. R^+ will denote the integral closure of R in an algebraic closure of its quotient field. We will refer to $x_1, \dots, x_n$ as a set of parameters in R provided $\text{ht}(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_k})R = k$ for any k distinct elements of the set. If R is catenarian, this is the same as assuming that $\text{ht}(x_1, \dots, x_n)R = n$ or that the set is part of a complete system of parameters. By $H_1(x_1, x_2, x_3; R)$, we mean the usual Koszul homology. In order to apply our main theorem, we need to recall a critical result from [HH, p.61].

Theorem 1.1. *If R is an excellent biequidimensional semi-local ring, $c \in R$ and R_c is Cohen–Macaulay, then c has a power c^k such that for every set of parameters $x_1, \dots, x_n$, $c^k H_i(x_1, \dots, x_n; R) = 0$ for all $i > 0$.*

In particular, when R is integrally closed of dimension three, we know that R_c is Cohen–Macaulay for every non-unit c and so every element of the maximal ideal has a power which kills all of the first Koszul homology modules.

Next we recall some definitions from [H2]. The last two were introduced in that article; the first has a longer history. Since we are only concerned with integral domains which do not contain the rational numbers, we may state the definitions more simply.

Definition. If $x \in R$, then x is in the plus closure of I if $x \in IR^+ \cap R$. We write $x \in I^+$.

Definition. If $x \in R$, then x is in the full extended plus closure of I if there exists $c \neq 0 \in R$ such that for every positive integer n , $c^{1/n}x \in (I, p^n)R^+$. We write $x \in I^{\text{epf}}$.

Definition. If $x \in R$, then x is in the full rank one closure of I if for every rank one valuation on R^+ , every positive integer n , and every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $d \in R^+$ with $v(d) < \varepsilon$ such that $dx \in (I, p^n)R^+$. We write $x \in I^{\text{r1f}}$.

In this article, we shall focus almost exclusively on the full extended plus closure. In fact, we could restrict our attention to a smaller closure which requires only that $c^{1/n}x \in IR^+$. However, this smaller closure is certain to be too small to serve as a tight closure analog in dimension four or larger. Unfortunately, in focusing on dimension three, this article will shed no light on whether or not the p^n is sufficiently helpful. We should note the trivial relationship between the closures — $I^+ \subset I^{\text{epf}} \subset I^{\text{r1f}}$.

Next we cite the critical result from [H2, p.820].

Theorem 1.2. *Let R be a regular local ring with $p \in J(R)$. If either full rank one closure or full extended plus closure has the colon-capturing property for finite extensions of regular local rings, then $I^{\text{epf}} = I^{\text{r1f}} = I$ for every ideal I of R . In particular, $I^+ = I$ for every ideal I of R .*

The statement in the earlier article did not mention the full extended plus closure in the hypothesis. However, it does not change the theorem since $I^{\text{epf}} \subset I^{\text{r1f}}$ and it emphasizes

how we shall use it here. There are two strengthenings of this result which we shall need and which are readily observable from reading the proof. The first is the very logical observation that in order to prove that ideals are closed in a particular regular local ring, we need only have the colon-capturing property for finite extensions of that ring. Hence the theorem may be restated for excellent rings of a fixed dimension. Moreover, the final statement still holds for all regular local rings of that dimension since if we were to have an ideal which was not plus-closed in a regular local ring, we would have such an ideal in its completion. The second observation, slightly more subtle, is that we only needed the colon-capturing property for systems of parameters which are powers of a single system of parameters. Rather than relying on this observation, we shall prove that, in the primary situation of interest here, this is the same as colon-capturing in general.

Lemma 1.3. *Suppose $\dim R = 3$ and y_1, y_2, y_3 is a system of parameters. Further suppose that for every system of parameters x_1, x_2, x_3 , each y_i kills $H_1(x_1, x_2, x_3; R)$. If for some $\delta \in R^+$, we have $\delta((y_1, y_2) :_R y_3) \subset (y_1, y_2)R^+$, then $\delta((x_1, x_2) :_R x_3) \subset (x_1, x_2)R^+$.*

Proof. In this proof we shall use Roman letters for elements of R and Greek letters for elements in R^+ . First we choose an element r such that $z_2 = y_2 + ry_1$ is not contained in any height one prime ideal which contains x_1 . Next choose elements r_1, r_2 such that $z_3 = y_3 + r_1y_1 + r_2y_2$ is contained in no height two ideals which contain $(x_1, x_2)R$ or $(x_1, z_2)R$. So x_1, x_2, z_3 and x_1, z_2, z_3 are also systems of parameters as is y_1, z_2, z_3 .

Suppose $a_3 \in ((x_1, x_2) :_R x_3)$. Then $a_3 \in ((x_1, x_2) :_R z_3)$ since z_3 kills colons and so we may write $a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_3z_3 = 0$. As $a_2 \in ((x_1, z_3) :_R x_2) \subset ((x_1, z_3) :_R z_2)$, we may write $b_1x_1 + a_2z_2 + b_3z_3 = 0$. Again, as $b_1 \in ((z_2, z_3) :_R x_1) \subset ((z_2, z_3) :_R y_1)$, we may write $b_1y_1 + c_2z_2 + c_3z_3 = 0$. Since $(y_1, z_2)R = (y_1, y_2)R$, we have $\delta c_3 \in (y_1, z_2)R^+$. Writing $\delta c_3 = \alpha y_1 + \beta z_2$, we have a relation $(\delta b_1 + \alpha z_3)y_1 + (\delta c_2 + \beta z_3)z_2 = 0$ and since no height one prime ideal of R^+ contains y_1 and z_2 , $\delta b_1 + \alpha z_3 \in z_2R^+$; hence $\delta b_1 \in (z_2, z_3)R^+$. In an identical fashion, we see that $\delta a_2 \in (x_1, z_3)R^+$ and finally that $\delta a_3 \in (x_1, x_2)R^+$. $\square$

Corollary 1.4. *Suppose $\dim R = 3$, and y_1, y_2, y_3 is a system of parameters. Further suppose that for any system of parameters x_1, x_2, x_3 , each y_i kills $H_1(x_1, x_2, x_3; R)$. If for some $c \in R$, we have $c^{1/n}((y_1, y_2) :_R y_3) \subset (y_1, y_2)R^+$ for every n , then the full extended plus closure has the colon-capturing property for R .*

Proof. Clearly, even the potentially smaller plus closure captures colons of the form $(0 : x)$ and $(x_1 : x_2)$. The hard case is given by the lemma. $\square$

Next we shall define a function τ on the positive integers which shall play a critical role in the proof of the main theorem. In light of (1.6), it seems likely that this function has been used previously; however we have not seen it. Strictly speaking, τ depends on the choice of prime integer p and should truly be denoted τ_p , but as the function will only be employed for p the characteristic of the residue field, we shall omit the subscript.

Definition. For a positive integer n , express $n - 1$ in base p and let $\bar{\tau}(n)$ be the sum of the digits. We take $\bar{\tau}(1) = 0$. Then define

$$\tau(n) = \frac{\bar{\tau}(n)}{p - 1}.$$

Note. It is more natural to define τ without the shift — say define σ by $\sigma(n - 1) = \tau(n)$ — and no doubt those who have encountered this function previously have seen it in this form.

In fact, the statement of (1.6) is nicer using σ . However, the proof of the main theorem is simpler using τ and in fact the shifted function appears to better capture what is going on.

Lemma 1.5. *Suppose i, j are positive integers and $n = i + j$. Let $a_k \cdots a_0$ be the expression for i in base p , i.e., $i = a_0 + a_1p + \cdots + a_kp^k$ with $0 \leq a_j < p$. Similarly, suppose $j = b_k \cdots b_0$, $n = c_k \cdots c_0$. Let $d = |\{j \mid a_j + b_j > c_j\}|$. Then the highest power of p which divides $\binom{n}{i}$ is p^d .*

Proof. This is just a restatement of a lemma in [H1, p.696]. It is actually slightly stronger than the statement there but is in fact what is actually proved. $\square$

Lemma 1.6. *Let $0 < j < i < p^L$ be integers.*

- (a) *The highest power of p which divides $\binom{i-1}{j-1}$ is $\tau(j) + \tau(i - j + 1) - \tau(i)$.*
- (b) *The highest power of p which divides $\binom{p^L-j}{i-j}$ is also $\tau(j) + \tau(i - j + 1) - \tau(i)$.*
- (c) *The highest power of p which divides $\binom{p^L}{i}$ is $L + \tau(i + 1) - \tau(i) - \tau(2)$.*

Proof. (a) To perform the addition $(i - 1) + (n - i) = n - 1$ in base p , one can first add the corresponding digits, allowing digits as large as $2p - 2$. The sum of the digits of this “number” will clearly be $\bar{\tau}(j) + \bar{\tau}(i - j + 1)$. Next, starting from the right, for each digit which is at least p , we deduct p and add one to the next digit. Each such carrying operation clearly reduces the sum of the digits by $p - 1$. Thus the highest power of p which divides $\binom{i-1}{j-1}$ times $(p - 1)$ is $\bar{\tau}(j) + \bar{\tau}(i - j + 1) - \bar{\tau}(i)$. The result quickly follows.

(b) This will follow from (a) once we verify that the highest power of p which divides $\binom{p^L-j}{i-j}$ is the same as the highest power of p which divides $\binom{i-1}{j-1}$. To see this, note that $\binom{i-1}{j-1} = \binom{i-1}{i-j}$ and the two quantities are $\frac{(p^L-j) \cdots (p^L-(i-1))}{(i-j)!}$ and $\frac{(i-1) \cdots j}{(i-j)!}$ respectively. Finally, whenever $j \leq k \leq i - 1$, $k < p^L$, and a power of p will divide $p^L - k$ if and only if it divides k . The result is now clear.

(c) We note that the highest power of p which divides $\binom{p^L}{i}$ is the highest power of p which divides $\frac{p^L}{i} = \frac{p^L}{(1)}$. The result now follows from part (a). $\square$

We conclude this section with two lemmas that will be needed for the main proof.

Lemma 1.7. *Let $K \geq -1$ be an integer and let $e = \frac{1}{p^{K+1}}$. Then $ei + K - \tau(i) \geq 0$ for every positive integer i .*

Proof. We induct on K . For $K = -1$, $e = 1$ and so we must show $i - 1 - \tau(i) \geq 0$ or equivalently $\tau(i) \leq i - 1$. But $\tau(i)$ is simply the sum of the digits of $i - 1$ divided by a positive integer and so cannot possibly exceed $i - 1$. Now we consider $K > -1$ and assume the result holds for $K - 1$. Suppose there exists i with $ei + K - \tau(i) < 0$. If p does not divide i , then $\tau(i + 1) = \tau(i) + \frac{1}{p-1}$ while $e(i + 1) = ei + e \leq ei + \frac{1}{p}$. It follows that $e(i + 1) + K - \tau(i + 1) < 0$. Similarly, if p does not divide $i + 1$, we see that $i + 2$ provides a counterexample. Thus we may produce a counterexample to the lemma with p dividing i . Writing $i = pj$ we have $epj + K - \tau(pj) < 0$. Since the base p representation of $pj - 1$ is just the base p representation of $j - 1$ with the final digit $p - 1$ added, we have $\tau(pj) = \tau(j) + 1$. Thus we have $\frac{p}{p^{K+1}}j + K - 1 - \tau(j) < 0$. However, this contradicts the $K - 1$ case of the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 1.8. *Let R be an integrally closed domain which satisfies our usual assumptions and suppose that there is an element $\sigma \in R$ such that $\sigma^{p-1} = p$. Let $x, y, z \in R$ where no height one prime ideal contains both p and y . Suppose $z = xw + yv$ where w, v are integral over $R[p^{-1}]$ and w satisfies the monic polynomial $T^n + a_1T^{n-1} + \cdots + a_n$. Further suppose $a_i \in p^{K-\tau(i)}R$ for every i . If $e = \frac{1}{p^{K+1}}$, then p^ew and p^ev are integral over R .*

Proof. If necessary, we adjoin a (p^{K+1}) st root of p and denote it p^e . Then p^ew satisfies the monic polynomial $T^n + d_1T^{n-1} + \cdots + d_n$ with $d_i = p^{ei}a_i$ for every i . Thus $d_i \in p^{ei+K-\tau(i)}R$. By (1.7), $d_i \in R$ and so p^ew is integral over R . Now this implies that p^ev is integral over $R[y^{-1}]$. By hypothesis, p^ev is also integral over $R[p^{-1}]$. Since R is integrally closed and no height one prime ideal contains both p and y , we see that p^ev is integral over R . $\square$

2. MAIN RESULTS

In the succession of lemmas leading up to the main theorem, S will denote an integral domain which contains the rational numbers. The results remain true and the proofs remain valid if S contains $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$, but in fact all applications of the lemmas will be to the ring $S = R[p^{-1}]$.

Demonstrating colon-capturing in dimension three amounts to proving that certain elements are in the plus closure of a two-generated ideal. A key tool for doing this is the following lemma from [H1, p.693].

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose $x, y, z \in S$ with $y \neq 0$. Let*

$$f(T) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i T^{n-i}$$

be a monic polynomial over S and suppose w is an element in an extension domain of S such that $f(w) = 0$. For $0 \leq i \leq n$, set

$$b_i = (-1)^i \sum_{j=0}^i \binom{n-j}{i-j} a_j z^{i-j} x^j$$

and let

$$g(T) = \sum_{i=0}^n b_i T^{n-i}.$$

Then $g(z - xw) = 0$. In particular, if each $b_i \in y^i S$, $(z - xw)/y$ is integral over S .

In order to prove the main theorem, we have to get from our starting point, an equation $p^N z = cx + dy$ in R , to an equation $\rho z = \gamma x + \delta y$ where γ, δ are integral over R and ρ is an m th root of p for some large m . Equivalently, we need to write $z = p^{-N}cx + p^{-N}dy$ as $\rho^{-1}\gamma x + \rho^{-1}\delta y$. The element $\rho^{-1}\gamma$ will be the w of (2.1) and w will be defined indirectly, by constructing $f(T)$ and letting w be a root of $f(T)$. According to the basic plan (which will have to be modified somewhat), the polynomial $f(T)$, with coefficients in $R[p^{-1}]$, will be constructed via a recursive procedure, which successively defines $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$. By choosing a_1 such that $b_1 \in yR[p^{-1}]$, a_2 such that $b_2 \in y^2R[p^{-1}]$, etc., we will force $\rho^{-1}\delta$ to be integral over $R[p^{-1}]$.

If we omit the condition that ρw be integral over R , constructing $f(T)$ is easy. In fact $(T - p^{-N}c)^n$ works for any choice of n . The next lemma is critical for choosing a better $f(T)$. It asserts that there is no subtle way that the recursion can fail. No matter how we

select an initial sequence of a_i 's (subject of course to the conditions on the b_i 's), we can always finish it if we omit the condition that ρw be integral over R .

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose $z = ax + by$ with $a, b, x, y \in S$ and let n be a positive integer. Further suppose $a_0 = 1, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1} \in S$ have been chosen with $k \leq n$ so that*

$$\sum_{j=0}^i \binom{n-j}{i-j} a_j z^{i-j} x^j \in y^i S \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, k-1.$$

Then we may find $a_k \in S$ such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^k \binom{n-j}{k-j} a_j z^{k-j} x^j \in y^k S.$$

Proof. First we will show that we can reduce to the case $z = ax$. As the lemma can be applied repeatedly if true, it is equivalent to the assertion that we may finish the polynomial $f(T) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i T^{n-i}$ to obtain a polynomial $f(T) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i T^{n-i}$ such that for every root w of $f(T)$, $(z - xw)/y$ is integral over S . Since $z = ax + by$, this is the same as $(ax + by - xw)/y$ being integral over S and of course this is that same as $(a - w)x/y$ being integral over S . Thus we can make the reduction. Now, returning to the original statement of the conclusion of the lemma, we need only be able to find a_k such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^k \binom{n-j}{k-j} a_j a^{k-j} x^k \in y^k S$$

or equivalently such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^k \binom{n-j}{k-j} a_j a^{k-j} \in (y^k :_S x^k).$$

This is trivial since a_k occurs on the left hand side with unit coefficient. $\square$

We are now ready to prove a special case of the main result. The proof of this proposition illustrates several of the ideas which form the basis of the later result.

Theorem 2.3. *Let p, x, y be parameters in R , an integrally closed domain which satisfies our usual assumptions. Assume there is an element $\sigma \in R$ with $\sigma^{p-1} = p$ and that p^N, x, y kill $H_1(p^m, x^m, y^m; R)$ for every positive integer m . Further assume that $H_1(p^N, x, y; R)$ is cyclic, generated by (z, a, b) . Then for any rational $e > 0$, there is a module-finite extension A of R with $p^e z \in (x, y)A$. Thus $z \in (x, y)R^{\text{epf}}$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove the result with $e = \frac{1}{p^{K+1}}$ for arbitrary K . We set $L = K + N$. We shall construct a polynomial $f(T) = T^{p^L} + a_1 T^{p^L-1} + \dots + a_{p^L}$ with coefficients in $R[p^{-1}]$ such that if w is any root of $f(T)$, $v = (z - xw)/y$ is also integral over $R[p^{-1}]$. If we can accomplish this with each $a_j \in p^{K-\tau(j)} R$, then by (1.8), the conclusion holds with $A = R[p^e, p^e w, p^e v]$. Thus the entire proof rests upon our ability to satisfactorily choose the a_j 's.

We shall eventually choose elements $a'_i, a''_i \in p^{K-\tau(i)} R$ for every integer i , $1 \leq i \leq p^L$. We shall define $a_0 = 1$ and $a_i = a'_i + y^i a''_i$ for every $i \geq 1$. Then, by (2.1), $v = (z - xw)/y$ is integral over $R[p^{-1}]$ provided $\sum_{j=0}^i \binom{p^L-j}{i-j} a_j z^{i-j} x^j \in y^i R[p^{-1}]$ for each $i \leq p^L$. We shall

refer to this inclusion for a specific i as the i th condition. The elements will be chosen to satisfy the conditions by a recursive procedure beginning with $i = 1$. At each step, we choose $a'_i \in p^{K-\tau(i)}R$ and $a''_{i-1} \in p^{K-\tau(i-1)}R$ such that the i th condition is satisfied. The $i = 1$ step is irregular as there is no a''_0 . Finally, the superfluous a''_{p^L} equals zero.

Since $p^N z + ax + by = 0$, $p^{N+K}z + p^K ax \in yR[p^{-1}]$. Hence, letting $a'_1 = p^K a \in p^K R = p^{K-\tau(1)}R$, we have $p^L z + a'_1 x \in yR[p^{-1}]$ and the first condition is satisfied regardless of the choice of a''_1 . In fact, it is important to note that the choice of a''_i never affects the i th condition. For the recursive step, we assume that we have chosen each a_k properly for $k < i - 1$ as well as a'_{i-1} so that the first $i - 1$ conditions are satisfied. For notational simplicity, it is convenient to assume $a_{i-1} = a'_{i-1}$. As we know that $\sum_{j=0}^k \binom{p^L-j}{k-j} a_j z^{k-j} x^j \in y^k R[p^{-1}]$ for each $k < i$, (2.2) yields

$$\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \binom{p^L-j}{k-j} a_j z^{k-j} x^j \in (x^i, y^i)R[p^{-1}].$$

Now let $z_i = p^{-K+\tau(i)-\tau(2)} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \binom{p^L-j}{i-j} a_j z^{i-j} x^j$. We claim $z_i \in R$. To prove the claim, it suffices to prove it one term at a time and so we need only show $p^{-K+\tau(i)-\tau(2)} \binom{p^L-j}{i-j} a_j \in R$ for each $j < i$. Using (1.6) and the fact that $a_j \in p^{K-\tau(j)}R$, we see that this is equivalent to

$$(-K + \tau(i) - \tau(2)) + (\tau(j) + \tau(i-j+1) - \tau(i)) + (K - \tau(j)) \geq 0$$

when $j > 0$. But this is clear since the left hand side is just $\tau(i-j+1) - \tau(2)$. For $j = 0$, we need

$$(-K + \tau(i) - \tau(2)) + (L + \tau(i+1) - \tau(i) - \tau(2)) \geq 0.$$

Since $L \geq K + 1$, it suffices to show that $1 + \tau(i+1) \geq 2\tau(2)$ and this too is clear. So the claim is verified.

As $z_i \in (x^i, y^i)R[p^{-1}] \cap R$, it follows that $z_i \in ((x^i, y^i) :_R p^m)$ for some m . Since x, y, p^N kill $H_1(p^m, x^m, y^m; R)$ for every positive integer m , $z_i \in (x^i, y^i)R + (xy)^{i-1}((x, y) :_R p^N)$. Then, by the cyclicity assumption, $z_i \in (x^i, y^i, (xy)^{i-1}z)R$. Write $z_i = c_{i1}x^i + c_{i2}y^i + c_{i3}(xy)^{i-1}z$. Since $\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \binom{p^L-j}{i-j} a_j z^{i-j} x^j = p^{K-\tau(i)+\tau(2)}z_i$, the choices

$$a''_{i-1} = -\frac{p^{K-\tau(i)+\tau(2)}c_{i3}}{p^L - (i-1)} \quad \text{and} \quad a'_i = -p^{K-\tau(i)+\tau(2)}c_{i1}$$

satisfy the i th condition. Obviously, $a'_i \in p^{K-\tau(i)}R$. Finally, to see that $a''_{i-1} \in p^{K-\tau(i-1)}R$, we note that the highest power of p which divides $p^L - (i-1)$ is the highest power dividing $\binom{i-1}{1}$, namely $p^{\tau(i-1)+\tau(2)-\tau(i)}$. Thus it suffices to show that $(K - \tau(i) + \tau(2)) - (\tau(i-1) + \tau(2) - \tau(i)) \geq K - \tau(i-1)$. This is an equality and the recursion step is complete, finishing the proof. $\square$

The cyclicity assumption only came into play at one point — to give us $z_i \in (x^i, y^i, (xy)^{i-1}z)R$. The key to dropping that assumption is to develop a way of using earlier z_i 's to help with later ones. We need to be able to say that for sufficiently large n and $i > n$, $z_i \in (x^i, y^i, (xy)^{i-1}z_1, (xy)^{i-2}z_2, \dots, (xy)^{i-n}z_n)R$. This will be shown presently; however a number of complications lay ahead. Instead of choosing each a_i in a two step procedure with an initial choice and then a single adjustment to help at the $(i+1)$ st step, we must

allow for multiple adjustments — adjustments that don't obviously preserve previously satisfied conditions. It is also not clear at the start of the process what the correct degree of the polynomial should be and so we must be able to adjust this as we go along.

Lemma 2.4. *Let p, x, y be parameters in R , an integrally closed domain which satisfies our usual assumptions. Assume that x, y kill $H_1(p^m, x^m, y^m; R)$ for every positive integer m . Further assume that $z_i \in ((x^i, y^i) :_R p^N)$ for every positive integer i . Then there exists a positive integer n such that for all $i > n$, $z_i \in (x^i, y^i, (xy)^{i-1}z_1, (xy)^{i-2}z_2, \dots, (xy)^{i-n}z_n)R$.*

Proof. Let $M_i = ((x^i, y^i) : p^N)$. Since $(x, y)((x^i, y^i) : p^N) \subset (x^i, y^i)R$ and R is integrally closed, it follows that $((x^i, y^i) : p^N) \subseteq (x^i, y^{i-1})R \cap (x^{i-1}, y^i)R = (x^i, y^i, x^{i-1}y^{i-1})R$. So $M_i = x^iR + y^iR + (xy)^{i-1}M_1$. Also let $Q_i = (x^i, y^i, (xy)^{i-1}z_1, (xy)^{i-2}z_2, \dots, z_i)R$. Clearly $Q_i \subset M_i$ and, noting $xyM_{i-1} \subset M_i$, $xyQ_{i-1} \subset Q_i$, multiplication by xy induces the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Q_i & \subset & M_i \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ Q_{i-1} & \subset & M_{i-1} \end{array}.$$

Next Let $\overline{M}_i$ and $\overline{Q}_i$ be the respective quotients modulo $(x^i, y^i)R$. Then our previous diagram induces

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \overline{Q}_i & \subset & \overline{M}_i \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \overline{Q}_{i-1} & \subset & \overline{M}_{i-1} \end{array}.$$

But the map on the right is an isomorphism and so $\overline{Q}_1 \rightarrow \overline{Q}_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \overline{Q}_i \rightarrow$ may be viewed as an ascending chain of submodules of the same noetherian module. Thus for some n , $\overline{Q}_{i-1} \rightarrow \overline{Q}_i$ is surjective for all $i > n$ and the result follows. $\square$

Before going on to the main theorem, we need several technical lemmas and the ideas behind them. First we remark that the easiest proof of (2.1) is a simple application of Taylor's Theorem. In fact, b_i is just $\frac{(-1)^i x^i}{(n-i)!} f^{(n-i)}\left(\frac{z}{x}\right)$ where n is the degree of $f(T)$. As S contains the rationals, the condition $b_i \in y^i S$ is equivalent to $x^i f^{(n-i)}\left(\frac{z}{x}\right) \in y^i S$. Interestingly, for fixed i , the latter condition is stable under taking antiderivatives. To see this, note that if $\tilde{f}(T)$ is an antiderivative of $f(T)$, then the degree of $\tilde{f}(T)$ is $n+1$ and $x^i \tilde{f}^{(n+1-i)}\left(\frac{z}{x}\right) = x^i f^{(n-i)}\left(\frac{z}{x}\right)$. Likewise, the condition is stable under taking derivatives provided $i < n$.

In the proof of the main theorem, we will have occasion to exploit both these observations, the first to increase the degree of the polynomial without destroying the previous steps and the second to “improve” previously chosen coefficients. The next two technical lemmas are just combinatorial translations of the two stability conditions, stated in a manner so that they can be most easily applied here. Lemma 2.5 relates to the antiderivative while the $M = L$ case of (2.6) relates to the derivative. The full statement of (2.6) is a combination.

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose $M > L$ are positive integers and $x, y, z, a_1, \dots, a_k$ are elements of S such that $\sum_{j=0}^i \binom{p^L-j}{i-j} a_j z^{i-j} x^j \in y^i S$ for all $i \leq k$ where k is an integer less than p^L . If $\tilde{a}_j = \left(\prod_{m=0}^{j-1} \frac{p^M-m}{p^L-m}\right) a_j$ for each $j > 0$, then $\tilde{a}_j = p^{M-L} q_j a_j$ where q_j is a unit in $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ and $\sum_{j=0}^i \binom{p^M-j}{i-j} \tilde{a}_j z^{i-j} x^j = p^{M-L} q_i \sum_{j=0}^i \binom{p^L-j}{i-j} a_j z^{i-j} x^j \in y^i R$ for all $i \leq k$.*

Proof. If $0 \neq m < p^L$, the highest power of p that divides $p^L - m$ is the highest power of p that divides m and the same is true for $p^M - m$ and so $\frac{p^M - m}{p^L - m}$ is a unit in $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$. For $m = 0$, the quotient is of course p^{M-L} . This gives the first half of the conclusion. Next note that

$$\frac{\binom{p^M - j}{i - j}}{\binom{p^L - j}{i - j}} = \frac{(p^M - j) \cdots (p^M - i + 1)}{(p^L - j) \cdots (p^L - i + 1)}.$$

Hence

$$\binom{p^M - j}{i - j} \tilde{a}_j = \left(\prod_{m=0}^{i-1} \frac{p^M - m}{p^L - m} \right) \binom{p^L - j}{i - j} a_j.$$

The second half follows immediately. $\square$

Lemma 2.6. *Let d, i, M, L be integers with $L \leq M$ and $0 < d < i \leq p^L$. Suppose $x, y, z, a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}$ are elements of S such that*

$$\sum_{m=0}^h \binom{p^L - m}{h - m} a_m z^{h-m} x^m \in y^h S$$

for all integers $h < i$. Let $\tilde{a}_j = 0$ for $j < d$ and

$$\tilde{a}_j = \frac{y^d \binom{p^L - j + d}{i - j} a_{j-d}}{\binom{p^M - j}{i - j}}$$

for $d \leq j \leq i - 1$. Then

$$\sum_{j=0}^k \binom{p^M - j}{k - j} \tilde{a}_j z^{k-j} x^j \in y^k S$$

for all $k < i$.

Proof. For every $k < i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{p^M - j}{k - j} \tilde{a}_j z^{k-j} x^j &= \sum_{j=d}^k \binom{p^M - j}{k - j} y^d a_{j-d} \binom{p^L - j + d}{i - j} z^{k-j} x^j / \binom{p^M - j}{i - j} \\ &= y^d \sum_{m=0}^{k-d} \binom{p^M - m - d}{k - m - d} a_m \binom{p^L - m}{i - m - d} z^{k-d-m} x^{m+d} / \binom{p^M - m - d}{i - m - d}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\binom{p^M - m - d}{k - m - d} \binom{p^L - m}{i - m - d}}{\binom{p^M - m - d}{i - m - d}} &= \frac{(p^M - m - d)! (p^L - m)! (i - m - d)! (p^M - i)!}{(k - m - d)! (p^M - k)! (i - m - d)! (p^L - i + d)! (p^M - m - d)!} \\ &= \frac{(p^L - m)! (p^M - i)!}{(k - m - d)! (p^M - k)! (p^L - i + d)!} \\ &= \binom{p^L - m}{k - d - m} q \end{aligned}$$

where q is a rational number independent of m . Thus

$$\sum_{j=0}^k \binom{p^M - j}{k - j} \tilde{a}_j z^{k-j} x^j = y^d x^d q \sum_{m=0}^{k-d} \binom{p^L - m}{k - d - m} a_m z^{k-d-m} x^m.$$

Since the final sum is in $y^{k-d}S$ by hypothesis, the first sum is in y^kS as desired. $\square$

We are at last ready to prove the main result.

Theorem 2.7. *Let p, x, y be parameters in R , an integrally closed domain which satisfies our usual assumptions. Assume there is an element $\sigma \in R$ with $\sigma^{p-1} = p$ and that p^N, x, y kill $H_1(p^m, x^m, y^m; R)$ for every positive integer m . Suppose $p^N z \in (x, y)R$. Then for any rational $e > 0$, there is a module-finite extension S of R with $p^e z \in (x, y)S$. Thus $z \in (x, y)R^{\text{epf}}$.*

Proof. The basic structure of the proof echoes that of (2.3). We prove the result with $e = \frac{1}{p^{K+1}}$ for arbitrary K by constructing a polynomial $f(T) = T^{p^L} + a_1 T^{p^L-1} + \cdots + a_{p^L}$ with coefficients in $R[p^{-1}]$ such that if w is any root of $f(T)$, $v = (z - xw)/y$ is also integral over $R[p^{-1}]$. If we can accomplish this with each $a_j \in p^{K-\tau(j)}R$, then by (1.8), the conclusion holds with $S = R[p^e, p^e w, p^e v]$. Thus the entire proof rests on our ability to satisfactorily choose the a_i 's. However, unlike the (2.3) proof, L is not determined at the start; it will also be chosen in the recursive procedure.

We now describe the recursion. For each integer i , $1 \leq i \leq p^L$, we shall choose a positive integer $L_i \geq L_{i-1}$ and elements $a_{1i}, \dots, a_{ii}$ such that (1) $a_{ji} \in p^{K-\tau(j)}R$ for every j and (2), with $a_{0i} = 1$, the condition

$$\sum_{j=0}^k \binom{p^{L_i} - j}{k - j} a_{ji} z^{k-j} x^j \in y^k R[p^{-1}]$$

will be satisfied for each $k \leq i$. The procedure ends when $i = p^{L_i}$ (something we still must demonstrate happens), at which time we get the desired polynomial $f(T)$ with $L = L_i$ and $a_j = a_{ji}$ for every j . We also let $z_1 = z$ and for $i > 1$, we let

$$z_i = p^{-E_i} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \binom{p^{L_{i-1}} - j}{i - j} a_{j,i-1} z^{i-j} x^j$$

where $E_i = K - \tau(i) + \tau(2)$. We shall also show that (3) $z_i \in ((x^i, y^i) :_R p^N)$.

For the initial step ($i = 1$), we let D_1 be the smallest integer such that $p^{D_1} z \in (x, y)R$. Then we may find $a \in R$ such that $p^{D_1} z + ax \in yR$. Choose $L_1 = K + D_1$ and $a_{11} = p^K a$ and we see that the first condition is satisfied with $a_{11} \in p^K R = p^{K-\tau(1)}R$. By hypothesis, $z_1 \in ((x, y) :_R p^N)$.

For $i > 1$, we first demonstrate (3). This is identical to the situation in (2.3). As we know that

$$\sum_{j=0}^k \binom{p^{L_{i-1}} - j}{k - j} a_{j,i-1} z^{k-j} x^j \in y^k R[p^{-1}]$$

for each $k < i$, (2.2) yields

$$\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \binom{p^{L_{i-1}} - j}{k - j} a_{j,i-1} z^{k-j} x^j \in (x^i, y^i) R[p^{-1}]$$

and so $z_i \in (x^i, y^i) R[p^{-1}]$. To see that $z_i \in R$, it suffices to prove it one term at a time and so we need only show $p^{-K+\tau(i)-\tau(2)} \binom{p^{L_{i-1}} - j}{i-j} a_{j,i-1} \in R$ for each $j < i$. Using (1.6) and

the fact that $a_{j,i-1} \in p^{K-\tau(j)}R$, we see that this is equivalent to

$$(-K + \tau(i) - \tau(2)) + (\tau(j) + \tau(i-j+1) - \tau(i)) + (K - \tau(j)) \geq 0$$

when $j > 0$. But this is clear since the left hand side is just $\tau(i-j+1) - \tau(2)$. For $j = 0$, we need $(-K + \tau(i) - \tau(2)) + (L + \tau(i+1) - \tau(i) - \tau(2)) \geq 0$. Since $L_{i-1} \geq K+1$, it suffices to show that $1 + \tau(i+1) \geq 2\tau(2)$ and this too is clear. So $z_i \in R$ and as $z_i \in (x^i, y^i)R[p^{-1}] \cap R$, it follows that $z_i \in ((x^i, y^i) :_R p^m)$ for some m . Of course, $N = m$ suffices by hypothesis and so (3) holds as desired.

Now let $Q_i^* = (x^i, y^i, (xy)^{i-1}z_1, (xy)^{i-2}z_2, \dots, xyz_{i-1})R$. Let D_i be the least nonnegative integer such that $p^{D_i}z_i \in Q_i^*$ (certainly $D_i \leq N$). Next let $L_i = L_{i-1} + D_i$ and let $a_{ji0} = \left(\prod_{m=0}^{j-1} \frac{p^{L_{i-1}-m}}{p^{L_{i-1}-m}} \right) a_{j,i-1}$. By (2.5), we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^k \binom{p^{L_i} - j}{k-j} a_{ji0} z^{k-j} x^j \in y^k R[p^{-1}]$$

for $k < i$. We also see that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \binom{p^{L_i} - j}{i-j} a_{ji0} z^{i-j} x^j = (p^{D_i}u)(p^{E_i}z_i)$$

where u is the unit $\left(\prod_{m=1}^{i-1} \frac{p^{L_{i-1}-m}}{p^{L_{i-1}-m}} \right)$. Since $p^{D_i}z_i \in Q_i^*$, we have a relation

$$p^{D_i}z_i + cx^i + \sum_{n=1}^{i-1} c_n(xy)^{i-n}z_n = by^i$$

and so

$$p^{E_i}u \left(p^{D_i}z_i + cx^i + \sum_{n=1}^{i-1} c_n(xy)^{i-n}z_n \right) \in y^i R[p^{-1}].$$

Letting $a_{ii0} = p^{E_i}uc$, we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^i \binom{p^{L_i} - j}{i-j} a_{ji0} z^{i-j} x^j = p^{E_i}u(p^{D_i}z_i + cx^i).$$

For each $n = 1, \dots, i-1$, we intend to find $a_{1in}, \dots, a_{i-1,in}$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \binom{p^{L_i} - j}{i-j} a_{jin} z^{i-j} x^j = p^{E_i}uc_n(xy)^{i-n}z_n.$$

Then we set $a_{ji} = \sum_{n=0}^{i-1} a_{jin}$ for $0 < j < i$ and $a_{ii} = a_{ii0}$. Clearly (1) will be proved if we show (1') a_{jin} is in $p^{K-\tau(j)}R$ for every j, n . To prove (2), we note that the i th condition follows from the definition:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^i \binom{p^{L_i} - j}{i-j} a_{ji} z^{i-j} x^j &= \sum_{j=0}^i \binom{p^{L_i} - j}{i-j} a_{ji0} z^{i-j} x^j + \sum_{n=1}^{i-1} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \binom{p^{L_i} - j}{i-j} a_{jin} z^{i-j} x^j \\ &= p^{E_i}u(p^{D_i}z_i + cx^i) + \sum_{n=1}^{i-1} p^{E_i}uc_n(xy)^{i-n}z_n \in y^i R[p^{-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (2) will follow if we show (2') $\sum_{j=0}^k \binom{p^{L_i}-j}{k-j} a_{jin} z^{k-j} x^j \in y^k R[p^{-1}]$ for $0 \leq n < i$, $0 < k < i$.

We shall define the set $\{a_{jin}\}$ and prove (1') and (2') using three cases: $n = 0$, $n = 1$, $n > 1$. For $n = 0$, $\{a_{jin}\}$ is already defined and (2') was observed above. For $j < i$, $a_{ji0} \in a_{j,i-1}R \subseteq p^{K-\tau(j)}R$ as desired and finally $a_{ii0} = p^{E_i}uc \in p^{K-\tau(i)+\tau(2)}R \subset p^{K-\tau(i)}R$, giving (1'). For $n = 1$, we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \binom{p^{L_i}-j}{i-j} a_{jin} z^{i-j} x^j = p^{E_i}uc_n(xy)^{i-1}z$$

by choosing

$$a_{jin} = \frac{p^{E_i}uc_n y^{i-1}}{\binom{p^{L_i}-j}{i-j}}$$

when $j = i - 1$ and $a_{jin} = 0$ otherwise. That

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \binom{p^{L_i}-j}{k-j} a_{jin} z^{k-j} x^j \in y^k R[p^{-1}]$$

for every $k < i$ is trivial since each $a_{jin} \in y^{i-1}R[p^{-1}]$. To see that $a_{jin} \in p^{K-\tau(j)}R$, we note that $a_{jin} = 0$ unless $j = i - 1$. In the latter case, we need only show

$$\frac{p^{E_i}}{\binom{p^{L_i}-(i-1)}{1}} \in p^{K-\tau(i-1)}R.$$

This requires only $(K - \tau(i) + \tau(2)) - (\tau(i - 1) + \tau(2) - \tau(i)) \geq K - \tau(i - 1)$ and in fact equality is clear.

Now we fix $n > 1$. To get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \binom{p^{L_i}-j}{i-j} a_{jin} z^{i-j} x^j = p^{E_i}uc_n(xy)^{i-n}z_n,$$

we recall that

$$z_n = p^{-E_n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \binom{p^{L_{n-1}}-j}{n-j} a_{j,n-1} z^{n-j} x^j.$$

We can obtain the desired inequality provided

$$\binom{p^{L_i}-j}{i-j} a_{jin} = p^{E_i}uc_n y^{i-n} p^{-E_n} \binom{p^{L_{n-1}}-j-n+i}{i-j} a_{j+n-i,n-1}$$

for $j = i - n, \dots, i - 1$ and $a_{jin} = 0$ otherwise. So for $j = i - n, \dots, i - 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} a_{jin} &= \frac{p^{E_i}uc_n y^{i-n} p^{-E_n} \binom{p^{L_{n-1}}-j-n+i}{i-j} a_{j+n-i,n-1}}{\binom{p^{L_i}-j}{i-j}} \\ &= (p^{E_i-E_n}uc_n) \frac{y^{i-n} \binom{p^{L_{n-1}}-j+(i-n)}{i-j} a_{j-(i-n),n-1}}{\binom{p^{L_i}-j}{i-j}} \end{aligned}$$

Applying (2.6), we see that (2') holds (use $i - n$ for d , L_i for M , L_{n-1} for L , and $a_{j,n-1}$ for a_j).

Finally, to prove that $a_{jin} \in p^{K-\tau(j)}R$, it suffices to show that

$$\frac{p^{E_i-E_n} \binom{p^{L_{n-1}-j-n+i}}{i-j} a_{j+n-i,n-1}}{\binom{p^{L_i-j}}{i-j}} \in p^{K-\tau(j)}R.$$

For $j+n-i > 0$, we apply (1.6) to see that this is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} (K - \tau(i) + \tau(2)) - (K - \tau(n) + \tau(2)) + \tau(j+n-i) + \tau(i-j+1) - \tau(n) \\ + (K - \tau(j+n-i)) - (\tau(j) + \tau(i-j+1) - \tau(i)) \geq K - \tau(j). \end{aligned}$$

However, the two sides of this expression are clearly equal. For $j+n-i = 0$, we must show

$$\frac{p^{E_i-E_n} \binom{p^{L_{n-1}}}{i-j}}{\binom{p^{L_i-j}}{i-j}} \in p^{K-\tau(j)}R.$$

Using (1.6), it suffices to show

$$\begin{aligned} (K - \tau(i) + \tau(2)) - (K - \tau(n) + \tau(2)) + (L_{n-1} - \tau(i-j) + \tau(i-j+1) - \tau(2)) \\ - (\tau(j) + \tau(i-j+1) - \tau(i)) \geq K - \tau(j). \end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to $\tau(n) + L_{n-1} - \tau(2) - \tau(i-j) \geq K$. Since $i-j = n$, this is equivalent to $L_{n-1} \geq K + \tau(2)$. Since $\tau(2) \leq 1$, and $L_{n-1} \geq K + 1$, this is clear. Thus (1') holds and we may satisfactorily perform the inductive step.

Finally, by (2.4) we see that for $i \gg 0$, $D_i = 0$ and so L_i is eventually constant. Thus we eventually reach the $i = p^{L_i}$ step and the proof is complete. $\square$

Remark 2.8. If $N = 1$ and $H_1(p, x, y; R)$ is cyclic, we may draw the stronger conclusion that z is in the plus closure of $(x, y)R$. The proof is a much simplified version of (2.3). We let $K = 0$, $L = 1$, and dispense with the τ function entirely. Everything works with far fewer steps. We do not know whether the plus closure captures the colon in the three dimensional case in general.

Now we state our corollaries.

Corollary 2.9. *For the class of equidimensional three-dimensional excellent semilocal domains of mixed characteristic, the full extended plus closure has the colon-capturing property.*

Proof. Let R be any equidimensional three-dimensional excellent semilocal domain of mixed characteristic. We may adjoin a $(p-1)^{\text{st}}$ root of p to R if R does not already contain one. We also take the integral closure. Our hypotheses are preserved and it suffices to demonstrate colon-capturing for the new domain. Choose x, y such that p, x, y is a complete system of parameters. By (1.1), replacing x, y by powers if necessary, we may assume that p^N, x, y kill all first Koszul homology modules. Then we can apply (2.7) to see that $((x, y) :_R p^N) \subset (x, y)^{\text{epf}}$. The result now follows from (1.4). $\square$

Corollary 2.10. *Let R be a three-dimensional regular local ring of mixed characteristic and let I be an ideal of R . Then $I = I^+ = I^{\text{epf}} = I^{\text{r1f}}$.*

Proof. It suffices to show $I = I^{\text{r1f}}$ since the other two closures are trapped in between. If an element is in the full rank one closure of I , this remains true after completing and so it suffices to prove the corollary for complete rings. Now we combine (1.2) and (2.9). $\square$

On behalf of the reader, I'd like to extend thanks to Craig Huneke, Paul Roberts, and the referee for various comments which led to a clearer presentation. In particular, it was Paul Roberts [R2] who brought to my attention why (2.5) and (2.6) work, the connection with derivatives and integrals.

REFERENCES

- [EG] E.G. Evans and P. Griffith, *The syzygy problem*, Ann. of Math. **114** (1981) 323–333.
- [H1] R. Heitmann, *The plus closure in mixed characteristic*, J. Algebra. **193** (1997) 688–708.
- [H2] R. Heitmann, *Extensions of plus closure*, J. Algebra. **238** (2001) 801–826.
- [Ho1] M. Hochster, *Contracted ideals from integral extensions of regular rings*, Nagoya Math. J. **51** (1973) 25–43.
- [Ho2] M. Hochster, *Canonical elements in local cohomology modules and the direct summand conjecture*, J. Algebra. **84** (1983) 503–553.
- [Ho3] M. Hochster, *Big Cohen-Macaulay algebras in dimension three via Heitmann's theorem*, preprint.
- [HH] M. Hochster and C. Huneke, *Infinite integral extensions and big Cohen-Macaulay algebras*, Ann. of Math. **135** (1992) 53–89.
- [LS] J. Lipman and A. Sathaye, *Pseudo-rational local rings and a theorem of Briançon-Skoda*, Michigan Math. J. **28** (1981) 199–222.
- [R1] P. Roberts, *Le théorème d'intersection*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I **304** (1987) 389–400.
- [R2] P. Roberts, *Heitmann's proof of the direct summand conjecture in dimension 3*, preprint.

Department of Mathematics, University of Texas at Austin, Austin TX 78712

E-mail: heitmann@math.utexas.edu